REMARKS

Claims 1 - 3, 5 - 8, and 10 - 20 are currently pending in this patent application, claims 1, 12 and 18 being independent claims, and claims 4 and 9 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 10, 12 - 14, and 18 - 20 have been amended in order to more particularly point out, and distinctly claim the subject matter to which the applicants regard as their invention. It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated March 6, 2007.

In the outstanding Office Action, the following rejections are set forth:

- (1) claims 1 7 and 9 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Arellano (U.S. Patent No. 6,694,482); and
- (2) claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Arellano</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,694,482) in view of <u>Lewis</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,355,472).

The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these rejections.

Reply to OA dated March 6, 2007

The primary reference of Arellano teaches a system for creating interactive multimedia

content. The applicant submits that Arellano does not teach that auxiliary data (as well as the

contents data) is also generated based on client information; thereby, reflecting the user's preferences

on the data to be delivered to provide the data further suitable for respective users.

In view of the above, the applicant submits that not all of the claimed elements, as now

recited in the claims filed herewith, are found in exactly the same situation and united in the same

way to perform the identical function in Arellano's device. Thus, there can be no anticipation of the

applicant's claimed invention, as now recited in the amended claims, filed herewith, based on the

teachings of the Arellano patent.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the outstanding anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

based on Arellano (U.S. Patent No. 6,694,482) is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

The secondary reference of <u>Lewis</u> is merely relied upon for teaching a "program prologue and

a program epilogue." However, Lewis similarly does not teach that auxiliary data (as well as the

contents data) is also generated based on client information; thereby, reflecting the user's preferences

on the data to be delivered to provide the data further suitable for respective users. Thus, even the

suggested combination of references would still fall far short in fully meeting the claimed invention,

-10-

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/617,352 Amendment filed September 6, 2007 Reply to OA dated March 6, 2007

as now recited in independent claim 1 from which claim 8 depends.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the outstanding obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on <u>Arellano</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,694,482) in view of <u>Lewis</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,355,472) is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/617,352 Amendment filed September 6, 2007 Reply to OA dated March 6, 2007

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP

Mel R. Quintos Attorney for Applicant Reg. No. 31,898

MRQ/lrj/ipc

Atty. Docket No. **030843** Suite 400 1420 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 659-2930

23850
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE